

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Figs. 1 and 2 have been amended to include labels as related art.

The Office Action objects to Figs. 1-7 for failing to "have a proper descriptive legends such as SGSN (serving GPRS support node)." The Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for the objection and the intended meaning of the above-quoted statement is indiscernible from the Office Action; therefore, withdrawal of the objections to Figs. 1-7 is warranted.

The specification has been amended in the manner suggested in the Office Action for overcoming the applied objection. No new matter is believed to be introduced by the amendment of the specification.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended, claims 2, 3, and 5 have been canceled, and claim 6 has been newly added. Support for the amendments is provided in the original claims and Fig. 6 and its accompanying description in the specification. (References herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

The cancellation of claim 5 obviates the 35 USC 101 rejection applied thereto.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Helander et al. (US 6,735,187). Claim 3 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Helander in view of Anderson et al. (US 2006/0135159). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicant respectfully traverses based on the points set forth below.

Claim 1 now recites features of canceled claim 3 and defines a radio network control apparatus that compares an address of a packet received from a mobile terminal with addresses in an internal address table to determine whether the received packet is to be directly transferred to an internal server and, if the determination is affirmative, transfers the packet to the internal server through an internal network. The claimed subject matter provides an advantage of reducing the traffic and scale of a communication system (see specification page 5, lines 20-24).

The Office Action acknowledges that Helander does not disclose the above-mentioned subject matter, but proposes that Anderson does (see Office Action section 7, second paragraph).

Anderson discloses, in the sole drawing, a mobile station MS, a base station BS that performs communication with mobile station MS, a radio network control apparatus RNC that performs communication with base station BS, and a control network node SGSN that performs communication with radio network control apparatus RNC. Anderson also discloses reading a destination address from a received packet in control network node SGSN and, when the destination address matches an address in an address register, directly transferring the received packet from control network node SGSN (see Anderson paragraphs [0010] and [0011]).

However, the Applicants' claimed subject matter identified above is related to the interior of a radio network control apparatus and Anderson's disclosure relates to a control network node SGSN. Moreover, Anderson does not mention details of control for wireless network controlling apparatus RNC. Further, although the Applicant's specification discloses a control network node SGSN, this control network node SGSN is not different from the conventional one disclosed in the Background Art section of the specification.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the teachings of Helander and Anderson, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 1. Independent claim 4 now similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from Helander and Anderson, but with respect to a method. Therefore, allowance of claims 1 and 4 and dependent claim 6 is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: January 15, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06108
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559